



RFP #BP1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) for

2006 Studies of Best Practices in Education

**Michigan Department of Education
Office of School Finance and School Law**

Estimated Timeline

Key Milestone	Date
Issue Date	August 23, 2006
Proposal Due Date	September 26, 2006
Award Recommendation Date	October 26, 2006
Anticipated MDE Superintendent Approval	October 30, 2006
Grant Start Date	November 1, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION FOR THE BIDDER.....	1
I-A PURPOSE	1
I-B ISSUING OFFICE.....	2
I-C TYPE OF GRANT.....	2
I-D INCURRING COSTS.....	2
I-E GRANTEE RESPONSIBILITIES	2
I-F RELEASE OF INFORMATION	3
I-G DISCLOSURE.....	3
I-H OWNERSHIP	3
SECTION II: WORK STATEMENT	4
II-A BACKGROUND/PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	4
II-B SCOPE.....	10
II-C TASKS.....	10
II-D ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	12
II-E GRANT CONTROL AND REPORTS	13
SECTION III: BIDDING INFORMATION	14
III-A QUESTIONS	14
III-B ADDENDA TO THE RFP	14
III-C PROPOSALS	14
III-D ORAL PRESENTATION	14
III-E ECONOMY OF PREPARATION	15
III-F SELECTION CRITERIA AND REVIEW PROCESS	15
III-G INDEPENDENT PRICE DETERMINATION	21
III-H RESPONSE DATE.....	21
III-I REJECTION OF PROPOSALS	22
III-J TIMELINE.....	22
III-K FUNDS ALLOCATED	22
III-L BACKGROUND MATERIALS AVAILABLE	22
SECTION IV: INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM BIDDERS.....	23
IV-A COVER	23
IV-B BUSINESS ORGANIZATION	23
IV-C STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	23
IV-D MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	23
IV-E COST PROPOSAL.....	24
IV-F ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND COMMENTS.....	26
IV-G APPENDICES.....	26
IV-H PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL.....	26
IV-I PROPOSALS WITH MULTIPLE STUDIES	26
SECTION V: ADDITIONAL TERMS, CONDITIONS, CERTIFICATIONS, AND REPRESENTATIONS	27
V-A INDEMNIFICATION.....	27
V-B GRANTEE'S LIABILITY INSURANCE	27



V-C	NON-DISCRIMINATION AND OTHER COMPLIANCE WITH LAW	28
V-D	ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSAL CONTENT.....	28
V-E	ASSURANCE OF GRANT CONDITIONS.....	28
V-F	OTHER TERMS	29
V-G	GOVERNING LAW	29
V-H	COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS.....	30
V-I	JURISDICTION.....	30
V-J	AMENDMENTS	30
V-K	CERTIFICATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS	31
GLOSSARY		32
EXHIBIT A: GUIDANCE ON SECTION 99A OF THE STATE SCHOOL AID ACT		33
EXHIBIT B: TEACHER PREPARATION INSTITUTIONS (TPI) PROJECT PLAN.....		35
EXHIBIT C: MATRIX OF MDE & ISD/RESA PARTNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES		38
EXHIBIT D: CITATIONS.....		39

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION FOR THE BIDDER

I-A PURPOSE

This Request For Proposals (RFP) provides interested parties with information to prepare and submit proposals for consideration by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), Office of School Finance and School Law, for the purpose of studying best practices in education.

This program will fund one or more projects to study current issues and priorities to help guide state policy makers (the State Board of Education (SBE), Legislators, and the Governor) in the improvement of education in Michigan.

MDE requests proposals to conduct studies within at most one year. Additional years of study may be proposed as options to be considered if additional funding becomes available.

All interested parties are encouraged to submit proposals in any area of interest to improving education in Michigan. This is the first year of this program and approximately \$500,000 in grants is planned and additional funding may become available.

This program is new and open to innovative proposals. Studies should

- Propose solutions (best practices) to help achieve Michigan's goals.
- Identify what data is available or will be gathered to support identified best practices.
- Avoid "re-inventing the wheel" (duplicating existing research).

If appropriate, studies could include quantitative studies or analysis of data that consider a question (hypothesis) and assess data to evaluate outcomes and factors relevant to education policy decision making. Though study topic areas are not limited, studies in the following areas are priority and encouraged:

1. **Teacher Preparation Institution (TPI) Project.** Assist MDE in developing data and researching issues regarding the TPI initiative (see Exhibit B: Draft TPI Project plans).
2. **Intermediate School Districts (ISDs).** Identify and review approaches in which ISDs can be used to assist MDE in the effective delivery of services (capacity building).
3. Review **middle school math** issues. Focus on ways to help students meet the new high school graduation requirements.
4. **Financially deficit districts.** Review the best practices in Michigan and elsewhere regarding the fiscal turnaround of deficit and financially strapped school districts.

5. **SBE Policies and Procedures Manual.** Review, evaluate, and rewrite SBE policies and procedures with particular focus on creating greater efficiencies or furthering education objectives for Michigan schools.
6. Provide a **national overview** of best practices in other states in the delivery of education services.
7. **Other topics.** This is an open topic category. Proposals are welcome to address other topics relevant to the objectives of the Best Practices program.

The seven topic areas above were defined by identifying critical concerns and issues of the Michigan legislature, the SBE, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Intermediate reports of results could be helpful to guide policy makers and are encouraged, as practical. Bidders are encouraged to include matching funds wherever possible. Though funding for this program is limited, MDE is interested in proposals with options that could be funded if additional resources become available. Proposals up to \$500,000 are welcome with consortium arrangements encouraged. As many as 10 proposals could be funded, so small studies are also encouraged. Proposals should be organized into separate efforts by topic so that grant awards may be given for part of an application by topic.

I-B ISSUING OFFICE

This RFP is issued for the State of Michigan by the Office of School Finance and School Law, Department of Education. The Office of School Finance and School Law is the sole point of contact in the State for this RFP. The Department of Education will only accept proposals submitted by individuals or organizations experienced in research.

I-C TYPE OF GRANT

It is proposed that, if a grant is entered into as a result of this RFP, it will be a fixed price negotiated grant. Negotiations may be undertaken with the bidder who appears to be the most qualified, responsible, and capable of performing the work outlined in this RFP. The grant that may be agreed upon will be the most advantageous to the State, price and other factors considered. The State reserves the right to consider proposals and modifications thereof received at any time before the award is made, if such action is in the interest of the State.

I-D INCURRING COSTS

The State of Michigan is not liable for any cost incurred by any bidder prior to execution of a Grant Agreement.

I-E GRANTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

The Grantee will be required to assume responsibility for all activities offered in their proposal whether or not he/she performs them. Further, the State will consider the



Grantee to be the sole point of contact with regard to matters, including payment of any and all charges, resulting from the anticipated Grant Agreement.

I-F RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Grantee-initiated publication or news releases of any information pertaining to the Grant Agreement, work performed under the Grant Agreement, products of the work and materials based upon the products shall occur only with written prior approval of the Michigan Department of Education.

I-G DISCLOSURE

After the Michigan Department of Education awards a grant under an RFP, all information in a bidder's proposal is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, Public Act 442 of 1976. This Act also provides for the complete disclosure of Grant Agreements and attachments thereto.

I-H OWNERSHIP

All products, data, reports, materials, and other tangible outcomes resulting from work performed under the Grant Agreement will be the exclusive property of the Michigan Department of Education, which reserves the rights to modify, copyright, or patent them, and protect their integrity and availability for public use.

Also see Section V: Additional Terms, Conditions, Certifications, and Representations.

SECTION II: WORK STATEMENT

II-A BACKGROUND/PROBLEM STATEMENT

The Best Practices Studies program was originally conceived to look at ways to better finance education in Michigan by assessing the structure of its educational financial and governance systems. That topic remains relevant and Michigan's policy makers remain interested in learning about innovative approaches to structuring its educational systems to identify improvement, cost efficiency, effectiveness, and savings opportunities (see topics 2, 4, and 6 above). Recent State budgets have done as well as can be expected to maintain funding for education in the face of fiscal challenges. Therefore more immediate policy challenges (topics 1, 3, and 5) were added. The list of seven topics presented in the Introduction reflects the realization by Michigan's policy makers that there will be modest, if any, increases in funding in real terms for education during this period in which Michigan must accelerate improvements in its educational systems.

This program is established at a time when several important initiatives are under way, including the ambitious goals of the federal No Child Left Behind Act and Michigan's Cherry Commission. These programs involve many objectives, including the following three major objectives¹:

- I. Graduate every K-12 student well prepared with life and academic skills;
- II. Double the current number of college graduates *working in excellent jobs* in Michigan; and
- III. Develop the best educational system in the world.

The goal in funding studies in best practices in education is to identify solutions and learn how to enable their implementation with tactical strategies and guidance for policy makers as we achieve these objectives ("Finish & Double").

The following current events help to present the context of these studies of best practices:

- Michigan High School Graduation Requirements. Michigan recently changed its high school graduation requirements. One major impact of this change is to increase the number of years of math that is required from students. This will increase the pressure to hire or train math teachers and to adjust programs in K-8 for the additional math in high school.
- Budget Realities. The State of Michigan has had a structural shift in its revenues and has had to cut budgets for the past 6 years. The State Aid fund for education has been protected from the kinds of significant budget cuts that other programs have faced, but many school districts face layoffs and deficits in real monetary terms. Michigan school districts are struggling to do more with less.
- There is a growing concern about the lack of math and science majors going into teaching, especially for elementary schools. Recent reports sound sirens of the

competitiveness of US students in math and the shortage of highly qualified math and science teachers.^{ii iii iv v} (For endnotes, see Exhibit D.)

- The funding for this program is new and the first new 'State' funding MDE has received since 2000. This program is that important to State policy makers and, though its funding is modest, represents an important effort to look at our educational systems to identify ways to make fundamental improvements. Organizations and individuals willing to contribute to this important effort are encouraged to contact any MDE Director or the Superintendent's Office at mde-supt@michigan.gov.

Background on the List of Selected Topics

Each topic area is described in more detail below. With each topic is a list of example questions that could be addressed by a study. Funding will not allow for all of these questions to be studied, though these are provided to offer direction.

TOPIC #1

Teacher Preparation Institution (TPI) Project. Assist MDE in developing data and researching issues regarding the TPI initiative. The TPI project is a critical new initiative that is described in a draft project plan in Exhibit B of this ITB.

It is well understood that teachers are critical to achieving Michigan's education system objectives. MDE seeks to better understand how it can improve the systems to prepare and provide ongoing training for teachers. The TPI project needs help to research issues related to this need.

Examples of questions to be addressed in this topic area:

- How can MDE improve teacher preparation, continuing education, and school accreditation programs in the effort to double the number of college graduates, while assuring *all* students graduate from high school?
- More specifically, in what ways are TPIs formalizing protocols of practice so there is a shared process for instructional design and delivery?
- How can technology be used to improve teacher preparation?

TOPIC #2

Intermediate School Districts (ISDs). Identify and review approaches in which ISDs can be used to assist MDE in the effective delivery of services (capacity building).

Michigan's educational systems are more autonomous than many other states. In looking at how to improve its systems, it is likely to be difficult to learn from systems with centralized statewide systems, like Texas or California. It is unlikely that Michigan would move toward those models. Instead studies of state systems like Pennsylvania or Virginia would be more instructive.

The role of ISDs in Michigan is not defined in Michigan law, so a review of their role and suggestions for how other states have benefited from other intermediate-level

structures (like ISDs) would be valuable. Particularly, a review of how to better utilize ISDs in the delivery of services (professional development and curriculum development/counseling) would be helpful.

MDE is in the process of developing ways in which it can team with ISDs and RESAs to deliver critical services. Exhibit C contains a draft matrix of roles and responsibilities that are being explored for integrated programs between MDE and ISD/RESAs. This matrix is being used by ISDs in their strategic planning processes. MDE is implementing these partnership concepts by doing awareness sessions for MDE staff. MAISA also has a committee devoted to researching options for ISD effectiveness, including consolidation and improvement of services.

Examples of questions to be addressed in this topic area:

- What tools, systems, or other practices have been successful or could be tried to assure that all services delineated in the Matrix are made available and delivered to all school districts who desire to take advantage of those services? What measures or other methods have been used to assure the effectiveness and efficiency of ISD/RESA services (see matrix)? What are effective ways to nudge all ISDs/RESAs towards the best use of the Matrix and look for evidence based systems that support that initiative?
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the ISDs. How could they be better organized and the resources better spent?
- How do other states organize their school districts in intermediate levels and are there best practices to suggest or instruct Michigan to improve its systems?
- What ways can ISDs/RESAs be used to build capacity for MDE programs to improve the delivery of educational services (curriculum specialists, training programs, special programs, etc.)?
- How have the Section 99B funds been used by ISDs and what does preliminary data suggest as to the effectiveness of the various programs (see guidelines in Exhibit A)?

TOPIC #3

Review **middle school math** issues with a particular focus on ways to help students meet the new high school graduation requirements for mathematics, which includes clearly defined expectations for all students.

Michigan's Grade Level Content Expectations can be found at www.michigan.gov/glce/. New High School Content Expectations can be found at www.michigan.gov/hsce/.

Examples of questions to be addressed in this topic area:

- In the following three areas, what needs to be done to better prepare students for the recent changes in standards for math for high school graduation:
 - Curriculum and Programs
 - Which curricula work?

- Which middle school curricula are best preparing students for success with the middle school GLCEs and high school mathematics?
 - How much time is actually spent in school on mathematics in grades K-5 and 6-8?
 - Standards
 - How has the implementation of the Mathematics Grade Level Content Expectations affected schools' mathematics programs and student achievement?
 - Teacher Prep
 - Are teachers prepared to teach to new grade-level content expectations? What professional development and/or support are needed to ensure that students achieve these expectations?
 - How can Michigan prepare, attract and keep high quality math teachers for middle and elementary schools?
 - Can mathematics be taught more effectively using mathematics teaching specialists in grades 3-5?
 - What can be done to insure that all mathematics teaching in grades 6-8 is done by mathematics specialists?
 - What can be done to increase the number of middle school mathematics teachers who have a college major in mathematics? Should Michigan initiate a certification in middle school mathematics (or perhaps a combined math/science certification)?
 - How can Michigan increase the number of its teachers with degrees from science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) programs?
 - What tools (e.g. textbooks/curricula, calculators, manipulatives) best support mathematics teaching and learning in the classroom?
 - What processes work best in the selection of mathematics textbooks and materials?
 - How can Michigan's Math/Science Centers and the Regional Literacy Centers be used to deliver professional development (PD) programs? Michigan is the only state with a statewide network of the Math/Science Centers. These centers are poised and ready to develop and deliver statewide PD, though have recently lost much of their state funding.
-

TOPIC #4

Financially deficit districts. Review the best practices in Michigan and elsewhere regarding the fiscal turnaround of deficit and financially strapped school districts.

Examples of questions to be addressed in this topic area:

- What practices have school districts used to turn around financial deficits?
 - What are the likely areas of cost savings and efficiencies?
 - What approaches are successful for collaborating or consolidating with other districts to reduce costs?
-

TOPIC #5

SBE Policies and Procedures Manual. Review and evaluate SBE policies and procedures with particular focus on creating greater efficiencies or furthering education objectives for Michigan schools.

Michigan's SBE has recently rewritten its bylaws. It's Policies and Procedures Manual needs to be rewritten to reflect the new bylaws and to be consistent with recent executive directives. Proposals are requested to review and rewrite this manual to improve the working of the SBE and to ensure its consistency with new SBE bylaws, and relevant Michigan regulations and laws.

The topic is less of a research study and more of a clean up job. Issues to be addressed:

- What should change in the SBE policies and procedures manual?
 - Which SBE policies and procedures should be retired? Which should be written? Which are in conflict with current laws or executive orders of the governor?
 - Should SBE policies and procedures always have a sunset clause?
 - Which are current and are recommended to remain unchanged?

This activity will involve SBE leadership and MDE staff to provide direction. After identifying changes to be made, the contractor will assist in the rewriting of the Manual on a "not to exceed" time and expense basis.

TOPIC #6

Provide a **national overview** of other states regarding best practices to improve the delivery of education services. Michigan policy makers are interested in how to improve the structure of its educational systems to improve their efficiencies and effectiveness. Policy makers seek an assessment of how Michigan could improve and what it does well in terms of efficiency and financial performance of its educational systems.

This topic is loosely defined to encourage studies of best practices found in other states. In formulating research projects, investigators must recognize the challenges of state policy formation in Michigan where local control of education is historically strong and the State has limited authority to tell the 550 school districts what they can and cannot do. The Headlee Amendment to the Michigan Constitution also creates unique constraints on state policies (<http://www.michigan.gov/budget/0,1607,7-157-21338-53317--F,00.html>).

Examples of questions to be addressed in this topic area:

- How does Michigan do compared to other states in sharing resources across school districts (e.g., across ISD level organizations)?
- How can Michigan schools continue to attract and retain the best teachers?
- Do teachers in different grades discuss and coordinate the curriculum? How can such discussions be promoted?
- How effective and efficiently does Michigan manage its educational systems?
 - What financial and operational measures would be useful to compare across school districts? How do Michigan schools compare with schools in other states?
- How can technology be used to improve school operations?
- How does Michigan do compared to other states in using technology, providing technical support for technology, and preparing teachers to use technology?
 - What are the best practices in implementing technology in schools?
 - What are benchmark measures for efficiencies, maintenance, technical, training and other supports required for effective implementation of technology in schools?

Information provided herein is intended solely to assist Contractors in the preparation of proposals. To the best of the State's knowledge, the information provided is accurate. However, the State does not warrant such accuracy, and any variations subsequently determined will not be construed as a basis for invalidating the RFP. The State reserves the right to cancel this RFP, or any part of this RFP, at any time.

II-B SCOPE

- ⊕ Contractor will provide the research, equipment, transportation costs, and other resources needed to conduct and deliver the research.
- ⊕ Status review meetings will be held at least every two months during the project.
- ⊕ Interim reports will be defined in work plans accepted during the course of the studies.
- ⊕ Presentation of results to MDE managers and State policy makers.
- ⊕ MDE will own the copyrights and data collected during the course of the project.

OUT OF SCOPE

- ⊕ Curriculum or training development.

ENVIRONMENT

- ⊕ Reports may be delivered via email.
- ⊕ Final and Intermediate Reports must be in MS Word 97 or greater.

II-C TASKS

Contractor shall provide Deliverables/Services and staff, and otherwise do all things necessary for or incidental to the performance of work, as set forth below:

The Vendor (A.K.A., 'researcher' or 'investigator') will produce the following deliverables:

- ⊕ Project Work Plan (detailed description of the approach and methods, deliverables, schedule, milestones, and budgets) within 15 working days of grant award
- ⊕ Research Plan (more detailed description of the plans for the study)
- ⊕ Monthly Project Status Reports
- ⊕ Status Meetings
- ⊕ Final reports should be delivered in hard copy (3 copies) and electronic (in MS Word).
- ⊕ Powerpoint Presentation (results of the study, upon request by MDE)
- ⊕ Other deliverables defined in an applicant's proposal (e.g., reports of intermediate results)

The Final reports will consist of the following components: ^{vi}

1. Title Page
Include the title, author(s), organizations(s), address and other contact information, statement acknowledging MDE support, and address the study to the Governor, Superintendent, Michigan legislature, and the members of the SBE.
2. Abstract (Only One Page)
The abstract should give the reader an idea of what your report contains and give them a picture of what will follow. The abstract should summarize the report, including *the nutshell of your proposed solutions (best practices), supporting evidence that it might work, and your results and conclusions.*
3. Table of Contents (Only One Page)
4. Introduction
In the Introduction, state the nature of the problem to be addressed, the objectives

of the study, and any hypotheses to be tested. Also, give a brief background for the study, which would typically include a brief review of the literature. Describe prior research that is relevant to the study. Relate the problem and its significance to the general discipline of study. This part of the report presents the background, justification, and relevance of your study.

5. Materials and Methods

Materials and Sources (subheading) - Describe EXACTLY what you used to do your research.

Methods (subheading) - Describe in enough detail so the reader will have an accurate idea of what was done in the study. Give a brief description of materials, sampling dates, locations and methods used so that a reader could duplicate your investigation. If commercial computer software is used, cite its full name and indicate the version used. The type of statistics used to analyze your data should be included and cited.

6. Results

The results section is not just a data summarization or a collection of tables and figures; *it should contain an explanation and description of the data, including any qualitative observations you made during the study.* Tell the reader exactly what you found, what patterns, trends, or relationships were observed. Illustrations in the results section may consist of graphs, photographs, or diagrams that visually depict your results.

7. Discussion

In the results section, the results are summarized and described. In the discussion section, they should be interpreted, critically evaluated, and compared to other reports. Whereas the results section presents the "news," the discussion section contains the "editorial." In the discussion, examine the amount and possible sources of variability in your data, including experimental error. Examine your results for bias and evaluate its effect in data interpretation. Develop arguments for and against your hypotheses and interpretations. Be sure to relate your findings to other studies and cite those studies. Draw positive conclusions from your study whenever possible.

8. Conclusions

The end of your report should contain a brief summary of your basic findings, followed by a set of clear statements that you believe explain your results. Was your hypothesis valid or invalid?

Based upon the findings, make specific recommendations to Michigan policy makers regarding new programs and policies that would improve education.

9. Citations

List the sources used during your study as well as those referenced in your report.

If a study produces Intermediate Results (reported before the end of the project), those results should be reported in the same format as the Final Report. Final Reports shall not exceed 25 pages and may be edited or altered at the discretion of the MDE to publish in journals or other media. Reports should be kept brief and written for policy makers with limited time to study the issues. More in depth discussions could be placed in appendices (not counted in the page limit).

Additional Requirements

- ⊕ A kickoff meeting and bi-monthly status meetings will be held at a location and time selected mutually agreed by MDE and the researcher(s). Phone conference calls may be selected for smaller projects or researchers located far from Lansing, Michigan.
- ⊕ The researcher(s) may be asked to prepare and present a presentation of their study as part of the project, after the final report is received.
- ⊕ All Vendor work on deliverables and services must be authorized to begin by the MDE Project Manager. The Vendor should not begin work on grant deliverables or requested services, until authorized by the State to do so. It is expected that studies will begin in November 2006 and complete during 2007. The study duration is up to investigators (Vendor) to propose.
- ⊕ The Vendor will maintain the project plan and timeline on a continuous basis for fixed priced deliverables. The Vendor proposed timeline must be approved by the MDE Project Manager before work begins on any deliverable or services. Any changes to the agreed upon timeline shall be communicated to the MDE Project Manager in writing explaining the reason for the change and the impact on the overall schedule.
- ⊕ Issue Management: Issues are those things that endanger the project. It includes imminent threats and events that may have already occurred. The Vendor shall identify how issues will be captured and reported.
- ⊕ Many of the topics in this solicitation are important to current public policy and therefore "time is of the essence".

II-D ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

CONTRACTOR STAFF, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- Perform research
- Manage the research project
- Report progress
- Write and revised reports
- Present findings (if requested)

STATE STAFF, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- Review, accept, and approve deliverables
 - Provide feedback regarding research direction and plans
 - Review, request changes, and acceptance of research results

II-E GRANT CONTROL AND REPORTS

(a) The Grantee will carry out this project under the direction of the Michigan Department of Education, Office of School Finance and School Law and the Chief Deputy Superintendent.

(b) The Grantee's project director will be responsible for conducting status meetings at least every two months with the MDE Project Manager and/or other MDE staff. The meeting time, location, format and duration will be mutually agreed by the MDE Project Manager and the Vendor.

(c) The Vendor shall provide reports to the MDE Project Manager on a monthly basis throughout the life of this grant project. Each monthly progress report must contain the following:

1. Delivery status and % completion of all grant deliverables.
2. Accomplishments: Indicate what was worked on and what was completed during the current reporting period.
3. Planned Work: Indicate planned work for the upcoming month.
4. Funds: Indicate the amount of funds expended during the current reporting period, and the cumulative total to date for the project.
5. Description of issues should include:
 - Issue
 - Resolution of each issue or,
 - Recommended Resolution of each issue.
6. Changes or modifications. Vendors should identify and explain reasons for any deviations from the project plan.
7. Risks to the project must be identified.

(d) Within one month after the completion of work under the Grant Agreement, the Grantee will submit a final Narrative Report describing the results and outcomes of the grant.

(e) Within 30 days following liquidation of the final expenditure, but not later than 60 days after the ending date of the grant, the Grantee will submit a Final Expenditure Report on forms provided by the Michigan Department of Education.

SECTION III: BIDDING INFORMATION

III-A QUESTIONS

Questions concerning the specifications contained in this RFP are to be submitted in writing to the Issuing Office at the following address:

Michigan Department of Education
Office of School Finance and School Law
P. O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909

Facsimile Number 517/335-4565

Point of Contact Sandra Marlowe
Administrative Support

Email MarloweS@michigan.gov

Researchers are encouraged to ask clarifying questions early regarding their research plans. The Issuing Office will not accept telephone inquiries or visitation by bidders or their representatives. All questions are to be put in writing. Answers that change or substantially clarify the RFP will be affirmed in writing; copies will be posted on the MDE Best Practices Program Web Page (www.michigan.gov/mdebp) and a notice will be sent to vendors who send an email to MarloweS@michigan.gov requesting to be added to the list of interested vendors. A preproposal meeting is not planned. Questions may also be submitted via facsimile.

III-B ADDENDA TO THE RFP

In the event it becomes necessary to revise any part of this RFP, addenda will be posted on the MDE Best Practices Program Web Page, and a notice will be sent to vendors who send an email to MarloweS@michigan.gov requesting to be added to the list of interested vendors.

III-C PROPOSALS

To be considered, each bidder must submit a complete response to this RFP, using the format provided in Section IV. Five copies of each proposal must be submitted to the Issuing Office. No other distribution of proposals is to be made by the bidder. Proposals must be signed by an official authorized to bind the bidder to its provisions. The proposal must remain valid for at least sixty days.

III-D ORAL PRESENTATION

Bidders who submit a proposal may be required to make an oral presentation of their proposals to the State. These presentations provide an opportunity for the

bidder to clarify his/her proposal to insure thorough mutual understanding. The Issuing Office will schedule these presentations, if required.

III-E ECONOMY OF PREPARATION

Each proposal should be prepared simply and economically, providing a straightforward, concise description of the bidder's ability to meet the requirements of the RFP. Fancy bindings, colored displays, promotional material, etc., will receive no evaluation credit. Emphasis should be on completeness and clarity of content.

III-F SELECTION CRITERIA AND REVIEW PROCESS

Summary:

Statement of the Problem	10 points
Management Summary/Work Plan	25 points
Prior Experience	20 points
Staff Quality/Allocation	25 points
Potential Impact of the Research	10 points
Cost and Price Analysis	10 points
<hr/>	
TOTAL	100 points

MDE utilizes an expert review panel when scoring its competitive grants. For this grant program, review teams will be composed of people both within MDE and outside MDE as needed. MDE staff will supervise the review.

Award selections will be based on merit and quality, as determined by points awarded for the Review Criteria Section and all relevant information. The following rubrics will be used as a rating instrument in the review process. All funding will be subject to the approval by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. All applicants will be notified of the Superintendent's action.

The maximum score for the following criteria is 100 points. In addition to the content of the rubric categories below, the Superintendent of Public Instruction may apply other factors in making funding decisions, such as (1) geographic distribution; (2) duplication of effort; (3) duplication of funding; (4) performance of the fiscal agent on previously funded initiatives.

REVIEW CRITERIA

The 2006 Best Practices in Education Program is intended to provide guidance to Michigan policy makers as they formulate policies to improve education in Michigan. The scoring rubric below should be used as a guide when writing the proposal. The reviewers will judge proposals against the elements described in the rubrics. The proposals most likely to be funded are those that have most completely addressed all the elements described in the "Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous" column of the rubrics. A narrative that is written in the sequence of the rubrics facilitates evaluation by the grant readers.

SCORING RUBRIC

A. Statement of the Problem

Provide a description of the need for the project. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of 10 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Provides no description of the problem.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Provides a vague description of the problem with no data references.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Provides a description of the problem supported by data references; and</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Provides a clear description of the problem supported by very relevant data references; and</p>
		<p>Describes a problem relevant to the program objectives.</p>	<p>Describes a problem relevant to the program objectives and demonstrates an in depth understanding of a category or other issue that is very relevant to the program objectives.</p>

B. Management Summary / Work Plan

Provide a description of the methodology, design, and strategies to be used to accomplish the project goals. This section is worth a maximum of 25 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal: Does not describe research-based activities;	The proposal: Provides a description of project activities that is a weak approach to achieve the stated objectives of the proposed project;	The proposal: Provides a description of project activities that is a good approach to achieve the stated objectives of the proposed project;	The proposal: Provides a comprehensive description of the researched-based activities that is an excellent approach to achieve the stated objectives of the proposed project;
Does not include a data driven process;	Does not include adequate data in the study;	Includes adequate data in the study;	Include more than adequate data in the study;
Reinvents research that already exists;	Has significant overlap with existing research;		Is mostly unique with little overlap with existing research;
Has a plan that does not include necessary resources; the plan is poorly organized; with no schedule or work plan;	Has a plan that does not include realistic budgets; the schedule and work plan have deficiencies but could be successful;	Has a reasonable work plan and schedule with necessary resources;	Has a comprehensive work plan and schedule with excellent resources;
Does not describe what previous work guided the development of the proposed plan; and	Does not demonstrate an understanding of previous work nor how it guided the development of the proposed plan; and	Does demonstrate how previous work guided the development of the proposed plan; and	Does demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of previous work and how it guided the development of the proposed plan; and
Does not describe expected results of the project.	Provides a weak description of the expected results of the project.	Provides a clear description of the expected results of the project.	Provides a clear description of very promising expected results of the project.

C. Prior Experience

Provide a description of the prior experience of the applicant and principle investigator(s). This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of 20 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Lacks a description of prior experience relevant to the categories and objectives of the project; and</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Describes prior projects of marginal relevance to the categories and objectives of the project; and</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Describes prior projects relevant to the categories and objectives of the project; and</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Describes prior experience exceptionally relevant to the categories and objectives of the project; and</p>
<p>Lacks costs, contact information, and starting and completion dates of projects successfully completed.</p>	<p>Lacks some required information about costs, contact information, and starting and completion dates of projects successfully completed.</p>	<p>Contains project descriptions, costs, contact information, and starting and completion dates of projects successfully completed.</p>	<p>Contains project descriptions, costs, contact information, and starting and completion dates of projects successfully completed.</p>

D. Staff Quality/Allocation

Provide a description of the key personnel and their responsibilities related to the completion of project goals. This section is worth a maximum of 25 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal: Does not identify key personnel; and provides no resumes of staff;	The proposal: Identifies key personnel but lacks resumes;	The proposal: Identifies key personnel and includes resumes of personnel;	The Proposal: Identifies key personnel and includes resumes of personnel;
Does not define project roles; and	Does define project roles; and	Defines project roles and responsibilities, but without clear lines of authority or the oversight necessary to complete the project goals; and	Provides clearly defined roles and responsibilities with clear lines of authority and the oversight necessary to complete project goals; and
Lacks personnel with experience in research relevant to the categories and objectives of the project.	Involves personnel with marginal experience in research relevant to the categories and objectives of the project.	Involves personnel with rigorous experience in research relevant to the categories and objectives of the project.	Involves personnel with exceptionally comprehensive experience in research relevant to the categories and objectives of the project.

E. Potential Impact of the Research

Provide a description of the potential impact and benefits of the proposed research project. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of 10 points.

Poor and incomplete	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal: Lacks a description of the potential impact and benefits of the project; and	The proposal: Identifies the impacts and benefits of the project; and	The proposal: Provides a good description of the impacts and benefits of the project; and	The proposal: Provides a comprehensive description of the impacts and benefits of the project; and
Does not have promise to make a significant impact.	Has limited impact and promise.	Has significant impact and promise.	Has an excellent impact and is very likely to deliver a promising result.

F. Cost Proposal

Provide a detailed project budget that includes costs for all participants and a detailed description of equipment and other resources required for project completion. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of 10 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The budget: Is incomplete and does not provide a clear picture of how grant funds will be expended; and	The budget: Is limited in scope and does not provide a detailed plan of how grant funds will be expended.	The budget: Is complete and provides information on rates for staff, equipment, and other expenditures; and	The budget: Is complete and provides detailed information on labor rates, equipment, and other costs; includes locations for grant funded resources; and
Includes costs and fees that are not reasonable.		Includes costs and fees that are reasonable.	Includes costs and fees that are very reasonable.

III-G INDEPENDENT PRICE DETERMINATION

- I. By submission of a proposal, the bidder certifies, and in the case of a joint proposal, each party thereto certifies as to its own organization, that in connection with this proposal:
 - (a) The prices in the proposal have been arrived at independently, without consultation, communication, or agreement, for the purpose of restricting competition as to any matter relating to such prices with any other bidder or with any competitor; and
 - (b) Unless otherwise required by law, the prices which have been quoted in the proposal have not been knowingly disclosed by the bidder and will not knowingly be disclosed by the bidder prior to award directly or indirectly to any other bidder or to any competitor; and
 - (c) No attempt has been made or will be made by the bidder to induce any other person or firm to submit or not submit a proposal for the purpose of restricting competition.
2. Each person signing the proposal certifies that she/he:
 - (a) Is the person in the bidder's organization responsible within that organization for the decision as to the prices being offered in the proposal and has not participated (and will not participate) in any action contrary to I(a),(b) and (c) above; or
 - (b) Is not the person in the bidder's organization responsible within that organization for the decision as to the prices being offered in the proposal but has been authorized, in writing, to act as agent for the persons responsible for such decision in certifying that such persons have not participated (and will not participate) in any action contrary to 1(a), (b) and (c) above.
3. A proposal will not be considered for award if the sense of the statement required in the Cost and Price Analysis portion of the proposal has been altered so as to delete or modify I(a), (b) or 2. above. If I(b) has been modified or deleted, the proposal will not be considered for award unless the bidder furnishes with the proposal a signed statement which sets forth in detail the circumstances of the disclosure and the Issuing Office determines that such disclosure was not made for the purpose of restricting competition.

III-H RESPONSE DATE

To be considered, proposals must be delivered through the postal service with a postmark date of September 26, 2006 or earlier. Proposals which are received with postmarks after the specified due date cannot be considered and will be returned

promptly to the bidder. Special deliveries are not encouraged. Bidders are solely responsible for the timely arrival of proposals at the Issuing Office.

III-I REJECTION OF PROPOSALS

The State reserves the right to reject any and all proposals in whole or in part, or to negotiate separately with any source whatsoever in any manner necessary to serve the best interests of the State. This RFP is made for information and planning purposes only. The State does not intend to award the grant solely on the basis of any response made to this request or otherwise pay for the information solicited or obtained.

III-J TIMELINE

This RFP requests proposals to conduct studies within at most one year. Additional years of funding may be proposed as options for MDE to consider. The activities in the proposed Grant Agreement cover up to a one year period, following approval of the grant by the State Board of Education or its designated representative and the signing of the Grant Agreement by all parties. The State may negotiate with vendors to accommodate different timelines to meet its needs.

It is anticipated that the Superintendent of Public Instruction will approve grant awards in November 2006 and that most projects will have an ending date of approximately July 30, 2007. Projects of a shorter duration are encouraged.

III-K FUNDS ALLOCATED

This is the first year of this program and approximately \$500,000 in grants is planned and additional funding may become available during FY2007 or later years.

Bidders are encouraged to include matching funds wherever possible. Though funding for this program is limited, MDE is interested in proposals that could be funded if additional resources become available. Proposals up to \$500,000 are welcome and consortia are encouraged. As many as 10 proposals could be funded, so small studies are also encouraged.

III-L BACKGROUND MATERIALS AVAILABLE

Visit the MDE Best Practices Program website (www.michigan.gov/mdebpp/) for more information.

SECTION IV: INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM BIDDERS

Bidder's proposal is to be submitted in the format outlined below. Use only the alphabetical numerals and headings listed below, and not the Roman numeral IV. All pages should have one-inch margins and be collated and numbered consecutively throughout. The font size should be no smaller than eleven-point.

Proposals are welcome to address one issue related to one topic. Or proposals may be submitted to cover multiple issues and multiple topics. Consortia are encouraged to study multiple topics through one grant project. Proposals that include separate studies of multiple topics should be written so that reviewers can evaluate and award each research study separately, by topic area (one of the seven topics listed in Section I-A, Purpose).

IV-A COVER

The cover page of your proposal must include (1) the RFP number, title of the grant, and study topics areas addressed by the proposal, (2) the name and address of your organization, (3) the phrase "Authorized Negotiator," followed by the typed name, title and phone number of the person authorized to negotiate the proposed Grant Agreement with the Department of Education, and (4) the phrase "Submitted with the assurance that this proposal will remain valid for at least sixty days from the due date, by:" followed by the signature, typed name and title, and date of signature of the person authorized to execute legally binding Grant Agreements with the State of Michigan. Bidders may list alternate negotiators in item "(3)" above.

IV-B BUSINESS ORGANIZATION

State the full name and address of your organization and, if applicable, the branch office or other subordinate element that will perform, or assist in performing the work proposed. Indicate whether you operate as an individual, partnership, or corporation; if as a corporation, include the state in which it is incorporated. If appropriate, state whether it is licensed to operate in the State of Michigan.

IV-C STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

State in succinct terms your understanding of the problem(s) presented by this RFP. Evidence of sufficient understanding should extend beyond a mere restatement or paraphrase of the problem statement from the RFP.

IV-D MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

I. Narrative

Provide a narrative overview of the proposed effort and of the product(s) that will be delivered.

2. Technical Work Plan

Provide a technical plan for accomplishing the work. Make specific reference to the objectives in the RFP and to the expected results. Describe the approach and what previous work has guided your proposed plan. Include a schedule and work plan. The work plans should indicate the number of staff hours you have allocated to each task on a staff person-by-task chart. (Include consultants, if any.) The amount and type of personnel time proposed should be commensurate with the tasks and activities required to achieve the objectives of the grant.

3. Prior Experience

Your organization must show the ability to perform the work. Include descriptions of similar project experience, including descriptions, costs, and starting and completion dates of projects successfully completed. Also, include the name, address, email, and phone number of the responsible official of the client organization who may be contacted about the projects listed.

4. Project Staffing

Your organization must be able to staff a project team which possesses the necessary talent and expertise in the fields of evaluation design and analysis. List the executive, professional and technical personnel who will be employed, noting individual skills and qualifications which apply to the work proposed. Show where these personnel will be physically located when they are working on the grant. Indicate which of these individuals by name and title you consider "key" to the successful completion of the study or project. Describe the need for consultants, if any, and show how their role is related to the objectives of the grant. Include a description of the roles and responsibilities of the proposed project team. Proposals containing multiple studies should identify the principal investigator for each study.

Attach resumes of qualifications of the proposed project staff.

5. Potential Impact of the Research

Please describe the potential impact and benefits of the proposed research project. Describe in one page or less (1-2 paragraphs) how it will help the State improve educational processes or policies. List which of the 7 topic areas your proposal addresses.

IV-E COST PROPOSAL

The information requested in this section is required to support the reasonableness of your quotation. The data will be held in confidence and will not be revealed to or discussed with competitors during the proposal evaluation process. The pricing portion of your proposal must be bound and sealed separately from the technical portion of your proposal. Since this part of your proposal will be separate from the rest, be sure to identify the RFP and your

agency on the first page and on the outside of the sealed wrapper. The cost proposal will be reviewed to ensure that the budget is adequate to support the project. There should be clear evidence of a relationship between budget items and project objectives.

Follow the format outlined below:

- A. Personnel Rates. Itemize so as to show the following for each category of personnel with a different rate per hour:
 - 1. Category; e.g., project manager, senior analyst, etc.
 - 2. Estimate hours
 - 3. Rate per hour
 - 4. Total cost for each category and for all personnel
- B. Cost of Supplies and Materials. Itemize
- C. Transportation Costs. Itemize by person and task to make clear that the amount and nature of travel is directly linked to the accomplishment of the objectives of the project. Show travel costs and per diem separately. Present rates and multipliers (e.g., miles, days, persons) such that reviewers can see how you arrived at the amounts prepared.
- D. Equipment Costs. Itemize
- E. Other Costs. Itemize
- F. General and Administrative Burden or Overhead. The link between the work to be done and the need for indirect costs should be made clear. Indicate the percentage and total. Universities may propose not more than 8 percent of their direct costs.
- G. Total Bid Price for Project.
- H. Project Breakdown by Category. Breakdown the cost proposal by category (subproject) so that MDE may choose to fund part of the proposal by category (each of the seven topics/categories) or project.
- I. Independent Price Determination. Include a statement as follows:

"This cost and price analysis is submitted in full compliance with the provisions of the paragraph titled 'Independent Price Determination' in Part III of the RFP to which this proposal is a response."
- J. Payment Schedule. The State expects the grant contracts resulting from this program to be fixed price contracts. Bidders should propose a payment schedule. The payment schedule should approximately reflect the costs and level of work expended prior to each invoice and should require

no less than 15% of the total grant amount held until all deliverables are accepted by the State. Two types of payment schedules are typical:
a) time and expense, not to exceed the grant total, with 15% withheld pending final approval; or b) fixed price for each grant deliverable.

IV-F ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND COMMENTS

Include any other information that is believed to be pertinent but not specifically asked for elsewhere.

IV-G APPENDICES

Include the Certifications and Representations from Section V-K and resumes of principal staff. Do not include lengthy general lists of publications or other documents unless their inclusion is ESSENTIAL to reviewer's understanding of your proposal and you make explicit reference to them in the body of the proposal.

IV-H PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL

Submit five copies of the grant proposal (one original and 4 copies), with a separately sealed price quotation, to MDE at the following address:

Michigan Department of Education
Office of School Finance and School Law
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48909

In addition, an electronic copy of the proposal on CD-ROM is welcome but not required.

Applicants may submit proposals that include more than one category. One application may include more than one project with the same project director. Applicants may also submit more than one proposal as long as the project director is different for each.

IV-I PROPOSALS WITH MULTIPLE STUDIES

Proposals containing multiple studies should have separate sections describing the "statement of the problem" and "management summary" for each study. As appropriate, information, such as resumes and prior experience, can be referenced once (e.g., as an appendix) to avoid redundancy when it applies to more than one study. The cost proposal should also be presented so that the cost for each study is clear. This is required so that MDE may award specific studies within a proposal. MDE prefers to fund at least one study in each of the seven topics/categories and encourages proposals that address multiple topics. Though teaming arrangement is not a selection criterion, partnerships, such as a consortia approach, is encouraged.

SECTION V: ADDITIONAL TERMS, CONDITIONS, CERTIFICATIONS, AND REPRESENTATIONS

V-A INDEMNIFICATION

The Grantee, as a condition of the Grant Agreement that may ensue from this RFP, shall indemnify and hold harmless the State of Michigan and its agents and employees from and against all claims, damages, losses and expenses, including attorneys' fees arising out of or resulting from the performance of the work, which includes all labor, materials and equipment required to produce the commodity, construction and/or service required by the Grant Agreement, provided that any such claim, damage, loss or expense (1) is attributable to bodily injury, sickness, disease or death, or injury to or destruction of tangible property (other than the work itself), including the loss of use resulting therefrom, and (2) is caused in whole or in part by any negligent act or omission of the Grantee, any subgrantee, anyone directly or indirectly employed by any of them or any for whose acts any of them may be liable, regardless of whether or not it is caused in part by a party indemnified hereunder.

In any and all claims against the State of Michigan or any of its agents or employees by any employee of the Grantee, any subgrantee, anyone directly or indirectly employed by any of them or anyone for whose acts any of them may be liable, the indemnification obligation under this indemnification agreement shall not be limited in any way by any limitation of the amount or type of damages, compensation or benefits payable by or for the Grantee or any subgrantee under Workers' Disability Compensation Acts, disability benefit acts or other employer benefit acts.

The obligations of the Grantee under this indemnification agreement shall not extend to the liability of the State of Michigan, its agents or employees arising out of (1) the preparation or approval of maps, drawings, opinions, reports, surveys, change orders, designs or specifications, or (2) the giving of or the failure to give directions or instructions by the State of Michigan, its agents or employees, provided such giving or failure to give is the primary cause of the injury or damage.

V-B GRANTEE'S LIABILITY INSURANCE

The Grantee, as a condition of the Grant Agreement that may ensue from their RFP, shall purchase and maintain such insurance as will protect the Grantee from claims set forth below which may arise out of or result from the Grantee's operations under the Grant Agreement, whether such operations be by the Grantee or by any subgrantee or by anyone directly or indirectly employed by any of them, or by anyone for whose acts any of them may be liable:

1. Claims under workers' disability compensation, disability benefit and other similar employee benefit act. A nonresident Grantee shall have insurance for benefits payable under Michigan's Workers' Disability Compensation Law for any employee resident of and hired in Michigan; and as respects any other employee protected by workers'

disability compensation laws of any other state, the grantee shall have insurance or participate in a mandatory state fund to cover the benefits payable to any such employee.

2. Claims for damages because of bodily injury, occupational sickness or disease, or death of his/her employees.
3. Claims for damages because of bodily injury, sickness or disease, or death of any person other than his/her employees, subject to limits of liability of not less than \$300,000 each occurrence and, when applicable \$300,000 annual aggregate, for non-automobile hazards and as required by law for automobile hazards.
4. Claims for damages because of injury to or destruction of tangible property, including loss of use resulting therefrom, subject to a limit of liability of not less than \$50,000 each occurrence for non-automobile hazards and as required by law for automobile hazards.
5. Insurance for Subparagraphs (3) and (4) non-automobile hazards on a combined single limit of liability basis shall not be less than \$300,000 each occurrence and when applicable, \$300,000 annual aggregate.

The insurance shall be written for not less than any limits of liability herein specified or required by law, whichever is greater, and shall include contractual liability insurance as applicable to the Grantee's obligations under the Indemnification clause of the Grant Agreement.

V-C NON-DISCRIMINATION AND OTHER COMPLIANCE WITH LAW

Each proposal must include a statement of assurance of compliance with all Federal and Michigan laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and with all requirements and regulations of the Michigan Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Education. The assurance must state that it is the policy of the bidder's organization that no person on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, marital status, or disability shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which the bidder is responsible or for which the bidder receives funding from the U.S. Department of Education or the Michigan Department of Education.

V-D ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSAL CONTENT

The contents of the proposal of the successful bidder may become contractual obligations, if a Grant Agreement ensues. Failure of the successful bidder to accept these obligations may result in cancellation of the award.

V-E ASSURANCE OF GRANT CONDITIONS

The submission of a proposal, signed by an official authorized to bind the agency submitting the proposal contractually, shall constitute assurance that the proposing agency has accepted, unconditionally and without reservation, all conditions, requirements, and specifications of this RFP. In addition, such submission shall constitute assurance that the submitting agency understands that all or any part of this RFP may be included by reference in any Grant Agreement based on this RFP.

V-F OTHER TERMS

V-F-1. Deliverable Acceptance

Final Acceptance of deliverables is tied to adequate performance of required Services and/or delivery of the Deliverables. Acceptance of deliverables is defined by the MDE Project Manager (or her designated representative). This includes adherence to the agreed-upon research methodology and standards.

V-F-2. Evaluation

The State and its approved Vendor agrees to cooperate with any evaluation of the program operations and provide MDE access to all requested data and records.

V-F-3. Intellectual Property Rights

Consistent with Section I-H, the State reserves a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable license to use, modify, reproduce, publish or in any way use, and to authorize others to use, for any purposes the whole or part of:

- (1) the recommendations and other results of the research projects and
- (2) the copyright in any work developed under this contract/grant.

These rights shall also apply to the results of any subcontract or any agreement under such subcontract to which a Vendor or subcontractor participated in the research project.

V-F-4. MDE Acknowledgement

Unless otherwise advised by the MDE, the Vendor shall acknowledge the support of MDE whenever publicizing the work under this Agreement. To this end, the Vendor shall include on any publication resulting from the work performed under this Agreement language in substantially the form set out below:

"This project has been funded at least in part with funds from the Michigan Department of Education. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the government of the State of Michigan."

V-G GOVERNING LAW

The Contract/Grant shall in all respects be governed by, and construed in accordance with, the substantive laws of the State of Michigan without regard to any Michigan choice of law rules that would apply the substantive law of any other jurisdiction to the extent not inconsistent with, or pre-empted by federal law.

V-H COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS

Contractor shall comply with all applicable state, federal, and local laws and ordinances ("Applicable Laws") in providing the Services/Deliverables.

V-I JURISDICTION

Any dispute arising from the Contract/Grant shall be resolved in the State of Michigan. With respect to any claim between the parties, Contractor consents to venue in Ingham County, Michigan, and irrevocably waives any objections it may have to such jurisdiction on the grounds of lack of personal jurisdiction of such court or the laying of venue of such court or on the basis of forum non conveniens or otherwise. Contractor agrees to appoint agents in the State of Michigan to receive service of process.

V-J AMENDMENTS

The Contract/Grant may not be modified, amended, extended, or augmented, except by a writing executed by the parties.



V-K CERTIFICATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Please review the assurances and certification (ACs) statements that are listed below. List any exceptions to these ACs. Sign and return this page with the completed application.

ASSURANCE CONCERNING MATERIALS DEVELOPED WITH FUNDS AWARDED UNDER THIS GRANT

The grantee assures that the following statement will be included on any publication or project materials developed with funds awarded under this program, including reports, films, brochures, and flyers: "These materials were developed under a grant awarded by the Michigan Department of Education."

CERTIFICATION REGARDING NONDISCRIMINATION

The applicant hereby agrees that it will comply with all federal and Michigan laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and, in accordance therewith, no person, on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, marital status or handicap, shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which it is responsible or for which it receives financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education or the Michigan Department of Education.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING TITLE II OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.), P.L. 101-336, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES (for Title II applicants only)

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Title II of the ADA covers programs, activities, and services of public entities. Title II requires that, "No qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by such entity." In accordance with Title II ADA provisions, the applicant has conducted a review of its employment and program/service delivery processes and has developed solutions to correcting barriers identified in the review.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING TITLE III OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.), P.L. 101-336, PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS AND COMMERCIAL FACILITIES (for Title III applicants only)

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Title III of the ADA covers public accommodations (private entities that affect commerce, such as museums, libraries, private schools and day care centers) and only addresses existing facilities and readily achievable barrier removal. In accordance with Title III provisions, the applicant has taken the necessary action to ensure that individuals with a disability are provided full and equal access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations offered by the applicant. In addition, a Title III entity, upon receiving a grant from the Michigan Department of Education, is required to meet the higher standards (i.e., program accessibility standards) as set forth in Title III of the ADA for the program or service for which they receive a grant.

I/We assure that all information provided within this grant proposal is true and accurate and make the above ACs as a required element of the solicitation document to which it is attached, understanding that the truthfulness of the facts affirmed here and the continuing compliance with these requirements and all requirements of the Request for Proposal (RFP) are conditions precedent to the award or continuation of the related Agreement(s).

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL

TITLE

DATE

NAME OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL

ORGANIZATION NAME

Glossary

CEPI	Center for Education Performance and Information
DIT	Department of Information Technology
DMB	Department of Management and Budget
FY	Fiscal Year
GLCE	Grade Level Content Expectations
HSCE	High School Content Expectations
ISD	Intermediate School District
IT	Information Technology
ITB	Invitation to Bid
LEA	Local Educational Agency
MAISA	Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators
MASA	Michigan Association of School Administrators
MASB	Michigan Association of School Boards
MDE	Michigan Department of Education
PSA	Public School Academy
RESA	Regional Educational Service Agency (like an ISD, provides a variety of programs and services that support student achievement from curriculum consulting and staff development to technology use in classroom activities and business operations).
SBE	State Board of Education
SOW	Statement of Work
SSAA	State School Aid Act
TPI	Teacher Preparation Institution

Exhibit A: Guidance On Section 99A of the State School Aid Act (2005 PA 155)

INTRODUCTION

Section 99b of the State School Aid Act (2005 PA 155) states that "An intermediate district shall use funds received under this section only for activities and efforts designed to improve pupil performance on the Michigan education assessment program mathematics assessments administered during grades 6 to 8 and to help the districts within the intermediate district meet adequate yearly progress requirements for mathematics under the no child left behind act of 2001, Public Law 107-110." The law implies that all activities must benefit students in grades 5-8 since the 6th grade assessment covers 5th grade content, 7th grade assessment covers 6th grade content and the 8th grade assessment covers 7th grade content. The intermediate school district (ISD) shall maintain control of the funds. The funds cannot be simply given to the districts to let them decide how it should be spent. In addition, ISDs must make every effort to design activities that all their districts can take advantage of and to include efforts that will support the achievement of students in all subgroups.

PLAN CRITERIA

Whenever possible, Sec. 99b funds should be used for activities and efforts that support or extend exemplary middle school mathematics initiatives that are already underway in the ISDs. These may include, but are not limited to, Mathematics/Science Partnership Grants (Title IIB), Improving Teacher Quality Grants (Title IIA), Title I efforts, Freedom to Learn and the Office of Special Education and Early Interventions Mathematics AYP project. Other criteria include:

- All professional learning activities should be aligned to the Michigan professional development vision and standards; the Mathematics Grade Level Content Expectations, 5th-7th grade; and the School Improvement Framework.
- There must be documented evidence that:
 - The activities were designed and implemented with collaboration from key administrative and curriculum staff from all the districts within an ISD's jurisdiction.
 - The ISD contacted their regional Mathematics/Science Center in the development and implementation of their plan.
 - Data supports the proposed activities, i.e., MEAP scores that identify weaknesses in content and in subgroups.
 - Research supports all proposed activities and efforts in improving student achievement on the 6-8 mathematics portion of the MEAP.

Guidance On Section 99A of the SSAA (Continued)

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES AND EFFORTS

- Professional learning at the ISD and/or district level related to identified middle school mathematics needs of the teachers in either content or pedagogy, including planning, implementation, materials, teacher stipends or substitute costs.
- Purchase and support of implementation of middle school mathematics curriculum aligned with Michigan's Grade Level Content Expectations in grades 5-8.
- Activities and materials that support English Language Learners or special education populations.
- Salaries for personnel that will plan and provide professional learning for districts in middle school mathematics, prorated with the amount of time spent on Sec. 99b efforts.
- Support administration efforts to improve mathematics by training curriculum leaders, principals and teacher coaches in best practices that support middle school mathematics achievement, e.g. Lenses on Learning, Content-Focused Coaching, etc.
- Aligning middle school curriculum with the Michigan Curriculum Framework and the Grade Level Content Expectations.
- Materials, including training to support use of materials, which support student achievement at the middle school level.
- After-school and summer school for students that need more sustained scaffolding with the middle school curriculum.

Exhibit B: Draft Teacher Preparation Institutions (TPI) Project Plan

Activity	Point Person	End Date
Develop project description and parameters	FJ/MAG/NM	April 2006 *
Recruit and employ a project director Project description Contract of employment	JH/MAG	June 2006 *
Conduct review of current proposed process for periodic review of TPI by interviewing or meeting with: MDE Staff TPI contacts NCATE & TEAC (side by side analysis)	Proj Dir	July – August 2006
Recruit and select work group members to research and develop recommendations for process improvement MDE Universities (ed and content both) Community Colleges ISD/ESA Teachers (experienced and new) Deans Content Associations MASSP, MAESP and Middle Cities	Proj Dir with input from many sources	August 2006
Convene work group Set meeting dates, times Develop timeline and deliverables Deliver recommendations to Supt	Proj Dir	August 2006
Work Group Research other states' review processes Research link between TPI and teacher effectiveness producing academic gains Research criteria TPIs use to ensure HQ teacher candidates Develop/revise criteria that MDE will use to approve and review TPIs Data collection to identify teacher supply and demand issues Assess current method for ensuring the inclusion of current curriculum standards in teacher prep programs and make necessary recommendations for improvement	Proj Dir	Sept 2006-Jan 2007

Activity	Point Person	End Date
Review the proposed TPI Performance Score for compliance w/Title II (HEA) and submit for SBE approval	Proj Dir/FJ	Oct 2006
Develop recommendations for Periodic Review process Process should be clear and easily understood Measurable elements from "annual report" should be included in Periodic Review Develop possible incentives to address supply and demand issues Develop overall timeline for revised Periodic Review process Include process for updating process Develop technical assistance plan to help under-performing TPIs	Proj Dir	Dec 2006
Continue the development of a performance assessment rubric for student teaching using the Entry Level Standards for Michigan student teachers and a plan for implementation	Proj Dir/FJ	May 2007
Recruit larger advisory group for input/review Convene advisory group Determine process for gathering input from stakeholders	Proj Dir/FJ and others	August 2006
Gather input/feedback on draft recommendations from stakeholders	Proj Dir	Jan 2007
Edit and refine recommendations Stakeholder feedback?	Proj Dir	Feb 2007
Submit recommendations to Superintendent	Proj Dir	April 2007

* Completed Activities, as of July 30, 2006

Other Elements of the TPI Project

Entry level standards – Review work that has been done and address revisions if necessary; submit to SBE for approval

Professional standards for teachers – Review standards, align with new high school content expectations

Review the MTTC – what do other states use? Can we revise it to align with new high school content expectations (and GLCE if not already done)? Is it less expensive/more practical to move to another assessment and away from a proprietary test? What do other states do and what are their results?

DRAFT



Exhibit C: Matrix of MDE & ISD/RESA Partnership Opportunities

See separately attached draft document,

"MICHIGAN-PARTNERSHIP-FOR-DELIVERY-OF-EDUC-SERV-2006-2007.doc".

Exhibit D: Citations

Endnotes:

From the Background Section, II-A:

- ⁱ See Michigan's Cabinet Action Plan for Education:
http://www.michigan.gov/documents/education_134980_7.pdf
- ⁱⁱ See the NCTM Report of the Task Force on Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Shortage:
http://www.nctm.org/about/taskforce/teacher_prep.pdf
- ⁱⁱⁱ The Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) 2003:
<http://nces.ed.gov/timss/Results03.asp>
- ^{iv} Report of the National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century:
<http://www.ed.gov/inits/Math/glenn/toc.html>
- ^v Briefing papers from the Council of Chief State School Officers:
<http://education.ti.com/sites/US/downloads/pdf/mathpaper04.pdf>
<http://education.ti.com/sites/US/downloads/pdf/mathpaper03.pdf>

From the Tasks Section, II-C:

- ^{vi} Report format description was copied, in part, from
<http://www.enviroliteracy.org/pdf/materials/1217.pdf>